

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIRON B. SPRINGFIELD,
Petitioner,
v.
ROBERT BURTON,
Respondent.

No. 2:22-cv-00568 TLN AC

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Petitioner is a former state inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this habeas corpus action challenging the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's computation of his eligibility for a youthful offender parole hearing. Petitioner filed a change of address on August 10, 2023 indicating that he had been released from confinement. On October 13, 2023, the undersigned ordered petitioner to show cause why his habeas corpus petition should not be dismissed as moot based upon his release from custody. ECF No. 18. Petitioner has not responded to the order to show cause and the time period in which to do so has expired. Based on a review of petitioner's claims, the court finds that the instant action is moot.

The case or controversy requirement of Article III, § 2, of the Constitution requires that the parties continue to have a personal stake in the outcome throughout all stages of the proceedings. Lewis v. Continental Bank Corp., 494 U.S. 472, 477-478 (1990). This means that, throughout the litigation, a plaintiff or petitioner "must have suffered, or be threatened with, an

1 actual injury... likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision.” Id. at 477. When the
2 relief sought is no longer available, the case becomes moot. See Weinstein v. Bradford, 423 U.S.
3 147, 149 (1975).

4 When a habeas petitioner challenges the validity of his conviction and resulting sentence,
5 completion of the sentence does not moot the case because the collateral consequences of
6 conviction create a continuing case or controversy. Chacon v. Wood, 36 F.3d 1459, 1463 (9th
7 Cir. 1994). This principle has no application here, however, because the petition does not
8 challenge petitioner’s conviction but only his eligibility for parole consideration as a youthful
9 offender.¹ It is well established that the collateral consequences doctrine is limited to habeas
10 petitions challenging the underlying criminal conviction. See Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1
11 (1998) (collateral consequences doctrine does not apply to habeas case challenging parole
12 revocation); Wilson v. Terhune, 319 F.3d 477, 480 (9th Cir. 2003) (collateral consequences
13 doctrine does not apply to habeas case challenging prison disciplinary proceeding). Here, the
14 mootness analysis follows straightforward Article III principles. The case no longer presents a
15 case or controversy because the relief sought by the petition—a youthful offender parole
16 hearing—is not longer available. Accordingly, the action is moot.

17 For these reasons, the undersigned recommends denying petitioner’s habeas corpus
18 petition and his motion to amend (ECF No. 18) as moot.

19 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:


- 20 1. Petitioner’s application for a writ of habeas corpus (ECF No. 1) and motion to amend
21 the petition (ECF No. 17) be denied as moot based upon petitioner’s release from
22 confinement.
- 23 2. Respondent’s motion to dismiss (ECF No. 15) be denied as unnecessary.

24 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge
25 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days
26 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written

27 ¹ Petitioner’s § 2254 challenge to his conviction has been denied on the merits. Springfield v.
28 Lozano, 2023 WL 4316774 (C.D. Cal. July 3, 2023) (adopting F&R).

1 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned
2 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” In his objections petitioner
3 may address whether a certificate of appealability should issue in the event he files an appeal of
4 the judgment in this case. See Rule 11, Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases (the district
5 court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the
6 applicant). Where, as here, a habeas petition is dismissed on procedural grounds, a certificate of
7 appealability “should issue if the prisoner can show: (1) ‘that jurists of reason would find it
8 debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling;’ and (2) ‘that jurists of
9 reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a
10 constitutional right.’” Morris v. Woodford, 229 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting Slack v.
11 McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)). Any response to the objections shall be served and filed
12 within fourteen days after service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file
13 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order.
14 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

15 DATED: February 6, 2024

16 
17 ALLISON CLAIRE
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28